

and has a responsibility to do everything that we can to encourage economic growth, jump-start the free enterprise system and put Americans back to work. Growing our economy and slowing Federal spending will be the best way that we can work together to get our economy back on track, to get out of rising debt and also out of the financial malaise that's underway. This legislation provides for some of these necessary steps.

I applaud my colleagues. I thank my colleagues also on the Republican side who were here to not only defend what we're doing but to talk about the need for such action. This bill that we are facing here today has the support of the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the chairman of the Rules Committee, and I applaud them for providing such an open and transparent process. I also encourage a "yes" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1410

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2551, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 359 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 359

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2551) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and except pro forma amendments offered at any time by the chair or ranking minority mem-

ber of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees for the purpose of debate. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 359 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2551, the fiscal year 2012 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2551. This rule represents a continuance of fulfilling the new Republican majority's pledge to implement a more open legislative process in providing for consideration of a bipartisan list of 16 amendments, which is more than at any time dating back to at least 1988. Twelve amendments were made in order in both the second session of the 103rd Congress and the first session of the 104th.

This is in stark contrast to the past two Congresses in which Democrat domination of this House provided for a collective grand total of four amendments that were allowed to be debated during the past 4 years, when three were made in order during the first session of the 110th and one in the first session of the 111th.

In fact, even considering a Legislative Branch appropriations bill is a change of pace from Democrat control when 2 years yielded no consideration of standalone funding legislation, second sessions of both the 110th and the 111th Congresses. In other words, with the consideration of this single rule and bill, the House Republican majority is making in order four times as many amendments on standalone legislative branch appropriations legisla-

tion as were provided for in the previous 4 years of liberal Democrat House domination combined.

Given the terrible budgetary mess we inherited from the liberal Democrats, the underlying bill reflects the Republican House majority's continued drive for restoring the fiscal restraint that is so desperately needed in this city.

The bill appropriates \$3.3 billion for legislative branch entities, including \$1.2 billion for House operations and \$2.1 billion for legislative branch agencies and other offices, including the Capitol Police, Congressional Budget Office, the Library of Congress, the Government Accountability Office, and Government Printing Office. This total is \$227 million, or 6 percent less than the current funding, and \$472 million, or 9 percent less than requested by the offices and agencies covered by this bill.

The cuts come on top of the 2.5 percent, or \$115 million, cut from fiscal year 2010 contained in H.R. 1473, which was the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution deal that was ultimately signed into law.

That bill provided \$4.5 billion for the legislative branch, including a reduction of \$55 million in funding for the House from the year before, and provides a 5 percent cut in Member, committee, and leadership office expenses, except for the Appropriations Committee, which offered a larger 9 percent cut.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I will insert at this place in the RECORD a budgetary outline of H.R. 2551.

Out of the \$1.2 billion provided in this bill for House operations:

\$574 million is provided for operating members' offices, \$39 million (or 6%) less than current funding and \$60 million (or 9%) less than requested.

\$293 million for allowances and expenses, \$24 million (representing 8%) less than current funding and \$15 million (or 5%) less than requested.

\$153 million for salaries and expenses of House committees, \$10 million (representing 6%) less than current funding, and \$10 million (or 6%) less than requested. -and-

\$178 million for functions performed by the various House officers and employees, including the Clerk of the House, the Sergeant at Arms, and the Chief Administrative Officer, \$16 million (or 8%) less than current funding, and \$26 million (representing 13%) less than requested.

Furthermore, the bill provides funding levels for the following agencies:

\$490 million for the Architect of the Capitol, which is \$37 million (or 7%) less than the current level, and \$129 million (or 21%) less than requested.

\$340 million for the Capitol Police which is equal the current funding, but \$47 million (or 12%) less than requested.

\$575 million for various activities of the Library of Congress which is \$53 million (or 9%) less than the current level and \$91 million (or 14%) less than requested.

\$113 million for activities of GPO which is \$22 million (or 16%) less than current funding and \$35 million (24%) less than requested.

\$44 million for CBO which is \$3 million (or 6%) less than current funding and \$3 million (or 7%) less than requested.

\$511 million for GAO which is \$35 million (6%) less than current funding and \$46 million (8%) less than requested.

Even with all of these funding reductions, it's easy for those who look at Washington, D.C., and see only political dysfunction to oppose providing any funding at all for the legislative branch. While they may see this bill simply as a vehicle for fattening the paychecks of congressional staff and other undesirables, we must remember the important work these support people provide in the function of the most important branch of government.

Contrary to popular belief, congressional staffers work notoriously long hours for relatively little pay and help us represent the views of our constituents. Furthermore, hundreds of thousands of constituents throughout the country are helped to navigate the Federal bureaucracy every day by our local case workers working in nearby district offices. Their work here is hardly the self-enrichment many people are led to believe by populist media sources eager to pose the catchiest headlines.

At the same time, we must remember the many important functions this funding provides in serving and protecting the American public. Given ever-evolving security threats, this bill funds the Capitol Police who protect critical infrastructure as well as secure the safety of the thousands who visit Capitol Hill every day. And we thank the Capitol Police for their invaluable service.

Furthermore, this bill's funding provides for the maintenance, operation, development, and preservation of 17.4 million square feet of buildings and more than 460 acres of land throughout Capitol Hill, including the House and Senate office buildings, the U.S. Capitol, Capitol Visitor Center, the Library of Congress buildings, the Supreme Court buildings, the U.S. Botanic Gardens, the Capitol power plant, and other facilities which are needed for Presidential inaugurations and other ceremonies of national importance.

The responsible funding level in this bill provides adequate funding for the critical functions of the legislative branch but also represents a step in the right direction towards enhancing government efficiency. During these times of fiscal restraint, this bill underscores the new House Republican majority's will to share in the pain of difficult spending decisions.

□ 1420

Mr. Speaker, not too long ago, it used to be that if funding levels weren't rising fast enough, then Congress was seen as cutting a program. That reality is no longer. When the new House Republican majority says we're going to cut spending, we actually reduce spending. This is the commonsense understanding of the American people which is reflected in the underlying legislation. And I will urge my colleagues over and over to support this rule and to support the underlying legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the rule; again, a rule that is not an open rule that allows for different amendments to be brought forth under this rule, as we have done with other appropriations bills. I also rise in opposition to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, when Americans think of Congress, they likely picture our beautiful Capitol Building, its iron dome, the rotunda filled with so many tourists each day, and so many sites on the National Mall and around the Capitol complex. But that is really just the physical infrastructure that we all live in and around. What really makes Congress function, or fail to function, are its people, its human capital, the staff that we have on the Hill that help keep Members informed and able to effectively operate in an increasingly complex world.

The bill before us risks squandering Congress' human capital. The bill cuts the legislative branch by 6.4 percent below 2011 and 9 percent below 2010 funding levels. What that means is the hardworking and underpaid and overworked men and women who staff our offices and our committees, giving long hours—frequently giving up their weekends. They'll be working through next weekend, Mr. Speaker. And I think there are very few jobs where they are actually thrilled to be informed that they actually have the weekend off. I know that not only myself but my staff rejoiced in leadership's decision to allow us not to work this weekend. I think that is a bar that most people assume they won't be working on weekends. Well, we assume in many cases we are, and we are actually very happy when we only have a 5-day workweek. That's the type of dedication that brings people into this line of work.

This cut will result in layoffs and pay cuts for members of the staff. And I would like to point out, it doesn't ask anything of the highest paid people here, the Members of Congress. We make \$174,000 a year. I am a cosponsor of a bill to reduce that by 5 percent. But here we are, cutting salaries for people making \$30,000 and \$40,000 a year without cutting the salaries of any of us who make \$174,000 a year. Again, I think that's just wrong. I think it's consistent with the Republican agenda of preserving tax cuts for people making over \$250,000 a year and making hardworking middle class families earning \$80,000, \$100,000 a year dig deeper and pay more by cutting student loans and programs that they benefit from.

So it shouldn't come as any surprise that that Legislative Branch appropriations bill is consistent with that in that it asks great sacrifices and at a time that we all agree our country has

to cut back. But it asks great sacrifices of those making \$30,000, \$40,000 a year and takes nothing away and demands nothing of those who are earning \$174,000 a year, namely, the Members of Congress themselves.

Another concern about this bill is, instead of strengthening security in the wake of violence against Members, including the events in Tucson several months ago, instead of investing in inspectors, they've slashed, under this proposal, every operation under the legislative branch except for Capitol Police, but including the Sergeant at Arms Office. Again, this represents a potential physical threat to Members at a time when, unfortunately, our national discourse has become more divisive than ever.

This bill also cuts the Library of Congress by 8.5 percent. I want to explain, Mr. Speaker, what the Library of Congress does and how we, as Members of Congress, rely on them. They are our objective research service. My staff and I, along with other Members of this body, rely on the Congressional Research Service. We get experts on issues on the phone, bring them to our offices to gain their expertise on complicated appropriations, budget issues, the peace process in the Middle East. This information is a vital part of producing sound legislation.

They are our only objective source of information. By reducing their ability to supply Members of Congress and our staff with quality information, we only empower the lobbyists and the other exclusive purveyors of information in this town who will give less objective information than Members of Congress and their staffs will have to increasingly rely on, rather than the Congressional Research Service.

The Government Accountability Office is cut by 6.4 percent. I want to point out that the GAO saves money. Again, every \$1 we spend at the GAO results in \$4 of savings. This is an office charged with finding savings and excess on duplicative expenditures. So by cutting their ability to do that, we actually increase wasteful spending elsewhere in the budget. It's the congressional watchdog. Taking away funding from the GAO means taking away methods on how we can alert policymakers to emerging wasteful spending and wasteful programs throughout government.

GAO is proven to protect taxpayer dollars. It was GAO that warned Congress about problems in the savings and loan industry. It was GAO that warned Congress about the dangers of deficit spending. If there's a looming issue that's not getting public attention but threatens public dollars, the GAO needs to be there to do thoughtful research and help Congress understand these issues.

I am also very concerned with the cuts to the Congressional Budget Office, the 6 percent cut. The Congressional Budget Office is critical to reducing our deficit. To cut Congressional Budget Office spending now, at a

time when we are coming up with trillion-dollar plans to reduce our deficit, would prove that the majority does not value proper accounting or prompt consideration of important policy proposals. We want to make sure that what we are passing has cost savings, reduces the deficit, and cuts spending, and the taxpayers are protected. We also want to make sure we pass legislation as expeditiously as possible. And if we're cutting off funding to the Congressional Budget Office and we expect layoffs, I'm not sure that we have the taxpayers' best interests at heart.

There were also amendments that were brought forth in the Rules Committee that, if we had an open amendment process, we would be able to include; but, unfortunately, they were not made in order under this particular rule, including a bipartisan amendment by DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Representative SCHWEIKERT. The amendment would have provided \$100,000—not of new money but rededicated from another account to name one of our rooms in the Capitol Visitor Center the Gabriel Zimmerman Meeting Room.

Who is Gabriel Zimmerman? He is the first congressional staff person in this country's history to die in the line of duty. He was with Representative GIFFORDS in the January 8 tragedy in Tucson, Arizona, that struck this country and shocked our Nation and really tore through the fabric of the congressional community. Representative SCHWEIKERT and Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ came together to provide a fitting memorial for a member of our congressional family that died in the line of service. Gabe Zimmerman was a loyal, dedicated public servant; and he made the ultimate sacrifice to this country as the first congressional staff person murdered in the line of duty in the history of our country.

This distinction wouldn't have cost taxpayers any money and would have recognized not only the devoted service of Gabe but also of the thousands of other staff people on Capitol Hill and I think would have been appropriate, particularly at a time when every Member's office will be involved with pay cuts and layoffs as a result of the 6.5 percent cut, to show that beyond the dollars, the giving of your life and the dedication of the staff that help keep us well informed in making decisions in the best interests of the country is appreciated by the institution of Congress as a whole.

I therefore oppose the rule, as well as the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Colorado would have the American people believe that we can't make any cuts in spending at the Federal Government level, but I don't believe that argument is going to go very far. The American people know that we can make big cuts in spending at the Federal Government level, and Repub-

licans are making sensible cuts in spending at the Federal Government level. In the leg branch, it's not a huge amount of money that we have control over; but we believe, on our side of the aisle, that we should make spending cuts everywhere.

Many millions of Americans have lost their jobs since the Democrats took control of this Congress in January of 2007. We had a 4.5 percent unemployment rate when they took over, and now we've had north of a 9 percent unemployment rate for several years. Those people didn't have any choice at all about whether they continued their income or not. What we're saying is, we want to continue the vital functions, those particularly that serve the American people. We want to keep this Capitol looking great.

□ 1430

We want to keep the Capitol Police force at full force. We want to give them the tools that they need. But everybody in Washington, D.C., can work a little harder and spend a little less money to make it easier on the American public, and that's what we're recommending in this bill. And I believe this rule does a very good job of representing the amendments that were presented to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on about what are the problems that we're facing here, but I think it's better if I quote someone who put some of the situation that we have here in perspective. And so I'd like to quote a Washington Post article by Charles Krauthammer, a brilliant essayist, who put forward this article.

He said other solutions are being suggested by "the man who ignored the debt problem for 2 years by kicking the can to a commission.

"Promptly ignored the commission's December 2010 report.

"Delivered a State of the Union address in January that didn't even mention the word 'debt' until 35 minutes into the speech.

"Delivered in February a budget so embarrassing—it actually increased the deficit—that the Democratic-controlled Senate rejected it 97-0.

"Took a budget mulligan with his April 13 debt plan speech. Asked in Congress how this new 'budget framework' would affect the actual Federal budget, Congressional Budget Office Director Doug Elmendorf replied with a devastating 'We don't estimate speeches.' You can't assign numbers to air.

"The flip-flop is transparently political. A clever strategy it is: Do nothing and invite the Republicans to propose real debt reduction first; and when they do—voting for the Ryan budget and its now infamous and courageous Medicare reform—demagogue them to death.

"And then up the ante by demanding Republican agreement to tax increases. So first you get the GOP to seize the left's third rail by daring to lay a fin-

ger on entitlements. Then you demand the GOP seize the right's third rail by violating its no-tax pledge. A full spectrum electrocution. Brilliant.

"And what have been Obama's own debt reduction ideas? In last week's news conference, he railed against the tax break for corporate jet owners—six times.

"I did the math. If you collect that tax for the next 5,000 years—that's not a typo, 5,000 years—it would equal the new debt Obama racked up last year alone. To put it another way, if we had levied this tax at the time of John the Baptist and collected it every year since—first in shekels, then in dollars—we would have 500 years to go before we could offset half of the debt added by Obama last year alone.

"Obama's other favorite debt reduction refrain is canceling an oil company tax break. Well, if you collect that oil tax and the corporate jet tax for the next 50 years, you will not have offset Obama's deficit spending for February 2011."

Mr. Speaker, there you have it: Liberal hypocrisy exposed in another brilliant Krauthammer essay.

The choice before the American people is clear. We can either continue accommodating the passions of the liberal elite in cementing a bloated dependency state fueled by job-crushing tax increases, or we can trim spending so private sector employers and innovators, who are the real creators of wealth, can do what they do best in healing the wounds of unsustainable government largesse.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle simply cannot stand any kind of cuts. What they want are tax increases and continued irresponsible spending.

Republicans are bringing a different message, a message from the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and also for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in opposition to the underlying bill.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee and former vice chair of the Leg. Branch Subcommittee, I am deeply saddened by Republicans' ongoing efforts to weaken and dismantle our democracy. The Leg. Branch appropriation bill is simply an inadequate and misguided bill. We must not gut one of the coequal branches of government. We should be working to ensure that we are strengthening and preserving the most direct voice the American people have in our government, the legislative branch, especially the House of Representatives, the people's House.

Passing this bill will undermine one of the fundamental building blocks of our democracy, and it will weaken our Nation. Failing to provide adequate resources to the leg. branch will mean

that all of our congressional offices, both here and in our home districts, will face cuts in staff. The constituent services that we provide would suffer right when our people need them the most.

Our constituents rely on our staffs to help us develop sound legislation and to provide constituent case work. Our constituents rely on them to keep them informed about the complex and incredibly diverse issues that fail our Nation each and every day.

Now, I worked as a staffer for my mentor and predecessor, Congressman, Mayor, Ron Dellums; so I know very well how hard staffers work to help us represent the American people. These staffers are paid much less. They work more hours than most public employees, not to mention the private sector employees.

We need to keep in place the resources necessary to attract the best and the brightest to public service. When you gut this budget, you are creating more unemployed people who will need to go on unemployment compensation.

This is an example of the policies that Republicans are putting forward to create more unemployment and a nonresponsive government. It is vital that our district offices and our Washington offices are fully staffed to make sure that our constituents—this is about our constituents—that they will continue to have access to the services so that they don't just get hung out there once again because, in this hard economic time, many, many people are desperate and they need our help.

This is just another signpost on the road to ruin during this "good luck" Republican Congress. This bill says good luck to finding a job. It says good luck to finding affordable health care. This bill says good luck to keeping your home and your family intact. Good luck to feeding your family and your children. When the public demands, as they should, constituent services and help, this bill says, good luck to our constituents.

Representative democracy is really on its way out the door. Case work will be greatly diminished with these unrealistic budget cuts. Bills like this clearly show the Republican agenda for what it is. It's really: Good luck, you are on your own.

Let me ask Members to please oppose this bill because this is not good. It's not good for our staffs; it's not good for our constituents; it's not good for the country.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. I want to thank the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina, who sits right next to me in the Rules Committee and has for a number of years. And I appreciate not only her leadership but her service.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stand up just as a Member of this body. We're all equal representatives in this body, and

I do recognize that there are people that come down here and talk about all the layoffs that will occur and all the hard times and people losing their insurance and all the dramatic things that will happen.

Mr. Speaker, we need a 6 percent cut. We need a 6 percent cut because we've been receiving outlandish increments of increases for a number of years, including the first year, I believe, that Speaker PELOSI was in, a 10 percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are having a tough time. But the American free enterprise system, when faced with these opportunities, and I think it's what will happen in our offices, we're all going to look at each other; and instead of laying somebody off, we'll all understand there's not enough money to go around and we're going to have to all take a sacrifice.

□ 1440

That's what I intend to do in my office, and I hope my employees will understand that.

This is going to mean some changes, and sometimes change is hard. But just to continue to receive more money because taxpayers, who control the money—that taxpayers would expect us to just answer every one of their questions and do every one of their things is an outlandish example of a government out of control.

We need to make sure that our offices are just as responsible as other areas of the government. It's time to cut back. It's time that we take a hit. It's time that we join with the rest of the American people and understand these are difficult times; these are difficult times because government is too big, costs too much money, listens too little, and now is unadaptive to the hard times themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I say let's vote for this Legislative appropriations bill, and let's cut the amount of money that we have for ourselves in the House of Representatives. A 6 percent cut helps lead the way, and we can do that. That's why Republicans are in the majority; we can make tough decisions in difficult times.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Now, again, I know how my colleague from Texas and my colleague from North Carolina have discussed how tough these economic times are and how Congress needs to tighten its belt, and that's true. But where is the actual belt-tightening for Members of Congress ourselves? What are Members being called upon to sacrifice? Did we cut our own salaries to help spare layoffs for staff people making \$25,000 a year? No. And how about the many Members of Congress who proudly talk about living in their offices. Are they going to start paying rent? They're essentially living rent free on the government dime. They use electricity, water and other taxpayer-paid-for resources. We have Members of Congress who are

squatters in government buildings. And as a businessman, I can tell you that if I owned a piece of commercial real estate and decided to start saving money or rent by living in my office, I would be violating the law. So don't tell us that you're being frugal by living in our office. You're living free at the taxpayers' expense, any Member who does that.

And how about the cars that Members lease? I don't know too many Americans who have jobs that give them a free car to use however they choose, but Members of Congress have that benefit. And many abuse it with car leases that cost as much as \$1,000 a month or more. Now, I appreciate there is an amendment on this issue, but those car leases should be eliminated in this bill, not capped at \$1,000. Members would still be permitted to have cars that cost \$950 a month paid for by taxpayers, at the same time we're slashing salaries of staff people making \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year.

In difficult economic times, it makes sense to cut back on everything. It makes sense to cut back on our own perks before laying off hardworking employees. Congress chose not to do this with this bill, and the closed process associated with this bill does not allow us to bring these proposals forward. When it comes time to cut, the majority has said hit the little guy, leave the big guy alone, hit the person who can least afford to go without. Talk about shared sacrifice right up until it involves giving up something that benefits you or your friends.

If you vote for this bill, Mr. Speaker, please do not tell me that you're willing to make the hard choices about the budget for the good of the Nation. You have made the easy choices. This bill cuts Members' day-to-day abilities to effectively represent constituents while leaving all of the perks of office untouched.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on both the rule and the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that Members of Congress should be extravagant in their spending in any way whatsoever, but I think it's up to the voters to hold those Members responsible for what they do. If there is a Member that is leasing a car that's paying an exorbitant amount of money, then the voters should turn that person out if they think they're wasting their money. I would certainly think that person is wasting his or her money. That's up to the voters to take care of.

We're doing our part here in the Congress. We are balancing between making sensible cuts and making sure that the public is well served when it visits Washington, D.C., and the public should be well served by the individual Members. And I hope that if there are abuses on the part of any Member of Congress, no matter which party he or she belongs to, that the voters will look into that and take care of that

person. But that is not our exact responsibility here. Our responsibility is, as it is everywhere, to allow a certain amount of money to be spent in the Members' offices, and then each Member should be held individually responsible.

Mr. Speaker, we have discussed at great length today why America needs this rule and this bill. Voting for these measures will allow the House to continue its work toward resolving the debt crisis currently gripping the Nation. As we continue this debate, we must remember the simple truth that tax increases have been tried before and led us to the mess that we have today.

We should not be raising taxes because tax increases do nothing more than fuel parasitic, wasteful government spending. We are cutting the spending for the leg branch in a very responsible way, and that's what we should be doing. But it is past time that we pursue an innovative idea, one that is unparalleled in modern American history, and that is to cut spending and shorten the long arm of government that is currently choking economic prosperity. That is what is happening in every appropriations bill that we're passing.

As we rapidly approach our Federal debt ceiling, our economy is struggling and people are looking for jobs. Americans crave accountability and belt-tightening in Washington and need the Federal Government to stop draining job-creating resources from the private sector to fund misguided adventures in social engineering. They demand action and they deserve answers.

H.R. 2551, for which this rule provides consideration, reflects the House Republican majority's unending commitment to restore the fiscal discipline that is so long overdue in this city. It represents a sensible balance between the vital need for budget restraint and funding the critical functions of the legislative branch.

Without compromising the safety or security of critical infrastructure, this bill further trims the fat and encourages efficiencies while demonstrating that we are not immune to feeling the effects of much needed spending cuts that are so desperately needed throughout our bloated Federal bureaucracy.

It is for these reasons that I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying bill so that we can begin to restore the trust Americans have in their Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 359 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 358.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 172, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 613]

YEAS—239

Adams	Gosar	Nunes
Aderholt	Gowdy	Nunnelee
Akin	Granger	Olson
Alexander	Graves (GA)	Olver
Altmire	Graves (MO)	Owens
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Palazzo
Austria	Grimm	Paul
Bachus	Guinta	Paulsen
Barletta	Guthrie	Pearce
Bartlett	Hall	Pence
Barton (TX)	Hanna	Petri
Bass (NH)	Harper	Pitts
Benishke	Harris	Platts
Berg	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Biggart	Hastings (WA)	Pompeo
Bilbray	Hayworth	Posey
Bilirakis	Heck	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Quayle
Black	Herger	Reed
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Rehberg
Bono Mack	Huelskamp	Reichert
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Ribble
Brooks	Hunter	Rigell
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rivera
Buchanan	Inslee	Roby
Bucshon	Issa	Roe (TN)
Buerkle	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Burton (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Camp	Jones	Rooney
Campbell	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Canseco	Kelly	Roskam
Cantor	King (IA)	Ross (AR)
Capito	King (NY)	Ross (FL)
Carter	Kingston	Royce
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Runyan
Chabot	Kissell	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Kline	Scalise
Coble	Labrador	Schilling
Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Schmidt
Cole	Lance	Schweikert
Conaway	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cravaack	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Crawford	LaTourette	Sessions
Crenshaw	Latta	Shimkus
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Shuler
Davis (KY)	LoBlondo	Shuster
Denham	Long	Simpson
Dent	Lucas	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Dold	Lungren, Daniel	Southerland
Dreier	E.	Stearns
Duffy	Mack	Stivers
Duncan (SC)	Manzullo	Stutzman
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Terry
Ellmers	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Emerson	Matheson	Thornberry
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Fincher	McCaull	Tipton
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Turner
Flake	McCotter	Upton
Fleischmann	McHenry	Walberg
Fleming	McKeon	Walden
Flores	McKinley	Walsh (IL)
Forbes	McMorris	Webster
Fortenberry	Rodgers	West
Fox	Meehan	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Galleghy	Miller (MI)	Wittman
Gardner	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Garrett	Mulvaney	Womack
Gerlach	Murphy (CT)	Woodall
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Gibson	Myrick	Young (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Neugebauer	Young (IN)
Gohmert	Noem	
Goodlatte	Nugent	

NAYS—172

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Pascarell
Andrews	Green, Al	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Green, Gene	Payne
Baldwin	Grijalva	Pelosi
Barrow	Gutierrez	Perlmutter
Bass (CA)	Hahn	Peters
Becerra	Hanabusa	Peterson
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Berman	Heinrich	Polis
Boren	Higgins	Price (NC)
Boswell	Himes	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Rahall
Braley (IA)	Hochul	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Holden	Reyes
Capps	Holt	Richardson
Capuano	Honda	Richmond
Cardoza	Hoyer	Rothman (NJ)
Carnahan	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rush
Chandler	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Kucinich	Schwartz
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Cooper	Levin	Sherman
Pompeo	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Costello	Lipinski	Slaughter
Courtney	Loebach	Smith (WA)
Critz	Lofgren, Zoe	Speier
Crowley	Lowey	Stark
Cuellar	Lujan	Sutton
Cummings	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	Markley	Tierney
DeFazio	Matsui	Tonko
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
DeLauro	McCollum	Tsongas
Deutch	McDermott	Van Hollen
Dicks	McGovern	Velázquez
Dingell	McIntyre	Visclosky
Doggett	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Donnelly (IN)	Meeks	Wasserman
Doyle	Michaud	Schultz
Edwards	Miller (NC)	Waters
Engel	Miller, George	Watt
Eshoo	Moore	Waxman
Farr	Moran	Welch
Fattah	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Filner	Napolitano	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Neal	Wu
Fudge	Pallone	Yarmuth
Garamendi		

NOT VOTING—21

Bachmann	Ellison	Sánchez, Linda
Bishop (GA)	Giffords	T.
Bishop (NY)	Griffith (VA)	Schock
Blumenauer	Hinchey	Scott, Austin
Bonner	Hirono	Sullivan
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Young (AK)
Castor (FL)	Landry	
Costa	Rogers (MI)	

□ 1513

Ms. CHU and Mr. COOPER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KINGSTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1315, CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 358) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1315) to amend the Dodd-Frank